arXiv:hep-th/9909221v3 4 Dec 1999

The Physical Projector and Topological Quantum Field Theories: U(1) Chern-Simons Theory in 2+1 Dimensions

Jan Govaerts[1] and Bernadette Deschepper

Institut de Physique Nucléaire
Université catholique de Louvain
2, Chemin du Cyclotron
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

Abstract

The recently proposed physical projector approach to the quantisation of gauge invariant systems is applied to the U(1) Chern-Simons theory in 2+1 dimensions as one of the simplest examples of a topological quantum field theory. The physical projector is explicitely demonstrated to be capable of effecting the required projection from the initially infinite number of degrees of freedom to the finite set of gauge invariant physical states whose properties are determined by the topology of the underlying manifold.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q

hep-th/9909221
September 1999

[1]E-mail: govaerts@fynu.ucl.ac.be

1 Introduction

The general gauge invariance principle pervades all of modern physics at the turn of this century, as a most basic conceptual principle unifying the fields of algebra, topology and geometry with those of the fundamental interactions of the elementary quantum excitations in the natural Universe. This fascinating convergence of ideas is probably nowhere else better demonstrated than within the recent developments of M-theory as the prime (and sole) candidate for a fundamental unification[1]. Given the many mathematics and physics riches hidden deep into the structures and dynamics of gauge invariant theories, a thorough understanding sets a genuine challenge to the methods developed over the years in order to address such issues. For example, a manifest realisation of the gauge invariance principle requires the presence among the degrees of freedom of such systems of redundant variables whose dynamics is specified through arbitrary functions characterizing the gauge freedom inherent to the description. This situation leads to specific problems, especially when quantising such theories, since some gauge fixing procedure has to be applied in order to effectively remove in a consistent way the contributions of gauge variant states to physical observables. Most often than not, such gauge fixings suffer Gribov problems[2, 3, 4], which must properly be addressed if one is to correctly account for the quantum dynamics of gauge invariant systems, certainly within a non perturbative framework. Among gauge theories, topological quantum field theories[5, 6] provide the most extreme example of such a situation, since their infinite number of degrees of freedom includes only a *finite* number of gauge invariant physical states, whose properties are in addition solely determined by the topology of the underlying manifold irrespective of its geometry.

In a recent development[7], a new approach to the quantisation of gauge theories was proposed, which avoids from the outset any gauge fixing and thus any issue of the eventuality of some Gribov problem[8]. This approach is directly set within the necessary framework of Dirac's quantisation of constrained systems[4]. No extension—with its cortège of ghosts and ghosts for ghosts—or reduction of the original set of degrees of freedom is required, as is the case for all approaches which necessarily implement some gauge fixing procedure with its inherent risks of Gribov problems[4]. Nonetheless, the correct representation of the true quantum dynamics of the system is achieved in this new approach, which uses in an essential way the projection operator[7] onto the subspace of gauge invariant physical states of a given gauge invariant system. Some of the advantages of the physical projector approach have already been explored and demonstrated in a few simple quantum mechanical gauge invariant systems[9, 10]. In the present work, we wish to illustrate how the same methods are capable to also deal with the intricacies of topological quantum field theories which, even though possessing only a finite set of physical states, require an infinite number of degrees of freedom and states for their formulation. Indeed, it will be shown that the physical projector precisely effects this required projection.

The specific case addressed here as one of the simplest possibilities, is that of the pure Chern-Simons theory in 2+1 dimensions with gauge group U(1). Moreover, the discussion will be made explicit when the topology of the underlying manifold is that of $\Sigma \times I\!R$, where Σ is a two dimensional compact Riemann surface taken to be a 2-torus T_2 for most of our considerations. This system has been studied from quite a many different points of view[6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. The consistency of the physical projector approach will be demonstrated by deriving again some of the same results through an explicit resolution of the gauge invariant quantum dynamics within this specific framework which avoids any gauge fixing whatsoever and thus also any Gribov problem.

The outline of the discussion is as follows. Sect.2 briefly elaborates on the classical constrained Hamiltonian formulation for Chern-Simons theories with arbitrary gauge symmetry group. These considerations are then particularised in Sect.3 to the U(1) case restricted to the

$\mathbb{R} \times T_2$ topology, enabling a straighforward Fourier mode analysis of the then discrete infinite set of degrees of freedom. In Sect.4, the Dirac quantisation of the system is developed, leading in Sect.5 to the construction of the physical projector. These results are then explicitely used in Sect.6 in order to identify the spectrum of physical states in the U(1) theory and to determine their coherent state wave function representations. Finally, the discussion ends with Conclusions, while some necessary details are included in an Appendix in order not to detract from the main line of arguments.

2 Classical Chern-Simons Theories

Let G be a compact simple Lie group of hermitian generators T^a ($a = 1, 2, \cdots, \dim\, G$) and structure constants f^{abc} such that $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$. In terms of the gauge connection A^a_μ, the action for the associated 2+1 dimensional Chern-Simons theory is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} S &= N_k \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\Sigma} dx^0 dx^1 dx^2\, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \Big[A^a_\mu \partial_\nu A^a_\rho - \tfrac{1}{3} f^{abc} A^a_\mu A^b_\nu A^c_\rho \Big] \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2} N_k \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\Sigma} dx^0 dx^1 dx^2\, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \Big[A^a_\mu F^a_{\nu\rho} + \tfrac{1}{3} f^{abc} A^a_\mu A^b_\nu A^c_\rho \Big] \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu - f^{abc} A^b_\mu A^c_\nu$, $\epsilon^{012} = +1$, while N_k is a normalisation factor (the usual gauge coupling constant g has been absorbed into the gauge connection A^a_μ).

As is well known, under small gauge transformations (*i.e.* continuously connected to the identity transformation), the Lagrangian density in (1) remains invariant up to a surface term. For large gauge transformations however (*i.e.* those transformations in a homotopy class different from that of the identity transformation), the action (1) changes by a term proportional to a topological invariant, namely the winding number of the gauge transformation. Consequently, at the quantum level, invariance under large gauge transformations requires that the normalisation factor N_k be quantised, which is the reason for its notation. Note also that no metric structure whatsoever is necessary for the definition of the action (1). Indices $\mu, \nu, \rho = 0, 1, 2$ are not raised nor lowered, while the notation, though reminiscent of a Minkowski signature metric, is in fact related to the specific topology $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$ considered for the three dimensional manifold. The choice of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ for the time evolution coordinate x^0 is made for the purpose of canonical quantisation hereafter, while any other type of compact topology for the three dimensional manifold may be obtained from $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$ through gluing and twisting[6].

Hence, (1) defines a topological field theory, namely a field theory whose gauge freedom is so large that its gauge invariant configurations characterize solely the topology of the underlying manifold, irrespective of its geometry[5]. In the present case, this is made obvious in terms of the associated equations of motion,

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} F^a_{\nu\rho} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad F^a_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad . \tag{2}$$

Indeed, the modular space of flat gauge connections on the base manifold is finite dimensional and purely topological in its characterization through holonomies around the non-contractible cycles in the manifold. Quantisation of the Chern-Simons theory thus defines the quantisation of a system whose configuration space—which actually coincides with its phase space—is this modular space of flat connections.

The action (1) being of first-order form in time derivatives of fields, is already in the Hamiltonian form necessary for canonical quantisation[16, 4]. Indeed, we explicitely have,

$$S = \int d^3x^\mu \Big[\partial_0 A^a_i\, N_k \epsilon^{ij} A^a_j + A^a_0\, N_k \epsilon^{ij} F^a_{ij} - \partial_i \left(N_k \epsilon^{ij} A^a_j A^a_0 \right) \Big] \quad , \tag{3}$$

where ϵ^{ij} $(i,j=1,2)$ is the two-dimensional antisymmetric symbol with $\epsilon^{12}=+1$. Consequently, the actual phase space of the system consists of the field components A_i^a $(i=1,2)$ which form a pair of conjugate variables with symplectic structure defined by the brackets

$$\{A_1^a(\vec{x},x^0),A_2^b(\vec{y},x^0)\}=\frac{1}{2N_k}\,\delta^{ab}\,\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \quad . \tag{4}$$

In addition, the first-class Hamiltonian of the system vanishes identically, $H=0$, as befits any system invariant under local coordinate reparametrisations, while finally the time components A_0^a of the gauge connection are the Lagrange multipliers for the first-class constraints

$$\phi^a=-2N_kF_{12}^a=-2N_k\left[\partial_1A_2^a-\partial_2A_1^a-f^{abc}A_1^bA_2^c\right] \quad , \tag{5}$$

whose algebra of brackets is that of the gauge group G,

$$\{\phi^a(\vec{x},x^0),\phi^b(\vec{y},x^0)\}=f^{abc}\phi^c(\vec{x},x^0)\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \quad . \tag{6}$$

That these constraints are indeed the local generators of small gauge transformations is confirmed through their infinitesimal action on the phase space variables A_i^a,

$$\delta_\theta A_i^a(\vec{x},x^0)=\left\{A_i^a(\vec{x},x^0)\ ,\ \int_\Sigma d^2\vec{y}\,\theta^b(\vec{y},x^0)\phi^b(\vec{y},x^0)\right\}=\partial_i\theta^a(\vec{x},x^0)+f^{abc}\theta^b(\vec{x},x^0)A_i^c(\vec{x},x^0) \quad , \tag{7}$$

while the Lagrange multipliers A_0^a must vary according to

$$\delta_\theta A_0^a(\vec{x},x^0)=\partial_0\theta^a(\vec{x},x^0)+f^{abc}\theta^b(\vec{x},x^0)A_0^c(\vec{x},x^0) \quad . \tag{8}$$

The constraints ϕ^a also coincide, up to surface terms, with the Noether charge densities related to the gauge symmetry. Indeed, the Noether currents $\gamma^{a\mu}=\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}N_kf^{abc}A_\nu^bA_\rho^c$ are conserved for solutions to the equations of motion, $\partial_\mu\,\gamma^{a\mu}=0$, so that the associated charges read

$$Q^a=\int_\Sigma d^2\vec{x}\,\gamma^{a(\mu=0)}=\int_\Sigma d^2\vec{x}\,\left[\phi^a+2N_k(\partial_1A_2^a-\partial_2A_1^a)\right] \quad . \tag{9}$$

The above conclusions based on the first-order action (3) are of course confirmed through an explicit application of Dirac's algorithm for the construction of the Hamiltonian formulation of constrained systems[4]. In particular, the brackets (4) then correspond to Dirac brackets after second-class constrainst have been solved for, while (3) then describes the so-called "fundamental Hamiltonian formulation"[4] of any dynamical system. Incidentally, note that surface terms which appear in (3) and (9) are irrelevant for such a Hamiltonian construction, which is in essence a local construct on the manifold Σ. In any case, they do not contribute when Σ is without boundaries.

3 The U(1) Theory on the Torus

Henceforth, we shall restrict the discussion to the gauge group $G=$U(1) and to the compact Riemann manifold Σ being the two dimensional torus T_2. This choice is made for the specific purpose of demonstrating that the physical projector approach is capable of properly quantising such theories in the simplest of cases, leaving more general choices to be explored elsewhere with the same techniques. In particular, the torus mode expansions to be specified presently may be extended to Riemann surfaces Σ of arbitrary genus through the use of abelian differentials and the Krichever-Novikov operator formalism[11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19]. The extension to non

abelian gauge groups G requires further techniques of coherent states not included in the present discussion.

Given the manifold $\Sigma = T_2$, let us consider the local trivialisation of this topology associated to a choice of basis of its first homology group with cycles a and b. Correspondingly, the choice of local coordinates x^1 and x^2 is such that $0 < x^1, x^2 < 1$. Related to this trivialisation of T_2, fields over T_2 may be Fourier expanded, so that the total number of degrees of freedom, though infinite, is represented in terms of a *discrete* set of modes over T_2. Explicitely, in a real parametrisation we have (from here on, any dependency on x^0 is left implicit while the single index $a = 1$ for $G =$U(1) is not displayed),

$$\begin{aligned} A_i(\vec{x}) &= \textstyle\sum_{n_1=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=0}^{+\infty} A_i^{++}(n_1,n_2) \cos 2\pi n_1 x^1 \, \cos 2\pi n_2 x^2 \, + \\ &+ \textstyle\sum_{n_1=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} A_i^{+-}(n_1,n_2) \cos 2\pi n_1 x^1 \, \sin 2\pi n_2 x^2 \, + \\ &+ \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=0}^{+\infty} A_i^{-+}(n_1,n_2) \sin 2\pi n_1 x^1 \, \cos 2\pi n_2 x^2 \, + \\ &+ \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} A_i^{--}(n_1,n_2) \sin 2\pi n_1 x^1 \, \sin 2\pi n_2 x^2 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Let us emphasize that such expansions do not include the terms which would be associated to the following modes: $A_i^{+-}(n_1,0)$, $A_i^{-+}(0,n_2)$, $A_i^{--}(n_1,0)$ and $A_i^{--}(0,n_2)$ $(n_1, n_2 = 1, 2, \ldots)$. Similar mode expansions—to which the remark just made also applies—are obtained for any quantity defined over T_2. For the U(1) generator $\phi(\vec{x})$, one has (for a non-abelian group G, terms bilinear in the $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ modes also contribute, which is the reason for our restriction to $G =$U(1))

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{++}(n_1,n_2) &= -4\pi N_k \Big[+ n_1 A_2^{-+}(n_1,n_2) - n_2 A_1^{+-}(n_1,n_2) \Big] \quad , \\ \phi^{+-}(n_1,n_2) &= -4\pi N_k \Big[+ n_1 A_2^{--}(n_1,n_2) + n_2 A_1^{++}(n_1,n_2) \Big] \quad , \\ \phi^{-+}(n_1,n_2) &= -4\pi N_k \Big[- n_1 A_2^{++}(n_1,n_2) - n_2 A_1^{--}(n_1,n_2) \Big] \quad , \\ \phi^{--}(n_1,n_2) &= -4\pi N_k \Big[- n_1 A_2^{+-}(n_1,n_2) + n_2 A_1^{-+}(n_1,n_2) \Big] \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since $\{\phi(\vec{x}), \phi(\vec{y})\} = 0$ in the abelian U(1) case, all the modes $\phi^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ have vanishing brackets with one another, while those for the phase space modes $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ are given by

$$\{A_1^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2), A_2^{\pm\pm}(m_1,m_2)\} = \frac{2}{N_k} \, f^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) \, \delta_{n_1,m_1} \, \delta_{n_2,m_2} \quad , \tag{12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f^{++}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{1}{(1+\delta_{n_1,0})(1+\delta_{n_2,0})} \quad , \quad f^{+-}(n_1,n_2) = \tfrac{1-\delta_{n_2,0}}{1+\delta_{n_1,0}} \quad , \\ f^{-+}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{1-\delta_{n_1,0}}{1+\delta_{n_2,0}} \quad , \quad f^{--}(n_1,n_2) = (1-\delta_{n_1,0})(1-\delta_{n_2,0}) \; . \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In order to understand how small and large gauge transformations—the latter not being generated by the first-class constraint $\phi(\vec{x})$—are represented in terms of these mode expansions, let us consider the general gauge transformation of the field A_μ, namely $A'_\mu = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta$, associated to the U(1) local phase transformation $U(\vec{x}, x^0) = e^{i\theta(\vec{x},x^0)}$. A point central to our discussion is that the arbitrary function $\theta(\vec{x}, x^0)$ may always be expressed as

$$\theta(\vec{x}, x^0) = \theta_0(\vec{x}, x^0) + 2\pi k_1 x^1 + 2\pi k_2 x^2 \quad , \tag{14}$$

where $\theta_0(\vec{x},x^0)$ is an arbitrary *periodic* function—*i.e.* a *scalar field* on T_2—while k_1 and k_2 are arbitrary positive or negative integers. Indeed, any small gauge transformation is defined in terms of some function $\theta_0(\vec{x},x^0)$ with $(k_1,k_2)=(0,0)$, while any large gauge transformation $\theta(\vec{x},x^0)$ may always be brought to the above general form with some specific function $\theta_0(\vec{x},x^0)$, the integers k_1 and k_2 then labelling the U(1) holonomies of the gauge transformation around the chosen a and b homology cycles in T_2. Any gauge transformation thus falls into such a (k_1,k_2) homotopy class of the gauge group over T_2. In terms of the mode expansion of the gauge parameter function (14), the non-zero modes $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ ($n_1\neq 0$ or $n_2\neq 0$, or both) are transformed according to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta A_1^{++}(n_1,n_2) &= +2\pi n_1\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,n_2) \quad , \quad \Delta A_2^{++}(n_1,n_2) = +2\pi n_2\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,n_2) \ , \\
\Delta A_1^{+-}(n_1,n_2) &= +2\pi n_1\theta_0^{--}(n_1,n_2) \quad , \quad \Delta A_2^{+-}(n_1,n_2) = -2\pi n_2\theta_0^{++}(n_1,n_2) \ , \\
\Delta A_1^{-+}(n_1,n_2) &= -2\pi n_1\theta_0^{++}(n_1,n_2) \quad , \quad \Delta A_2^{-+}(n_1,n_2) = +2\pi n_2\theta_0^{--}(n_1,n_2) \ , \\
\Delta A_1^{--}(n_1,n_2) &= -2\pi n_1\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,n_2) \quad , \quad \Delta A_2^{--}(n_1,n_2) = -2\pi n_2\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,n_2) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\Delta A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)=\Big(A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\Big)'-A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$, while the zero modes $A_i^{++}(0,0)$ transform as

$$\Delta A_1^{++}(0,0)=2\pi k_1 \quad , \quad \Delta A_2^{++}(0,0)=2\pi k_2 \quad . \tag{16}$$

These different expressions thus nicely establish that small gauge transformations—generated by the first-class constraint $\phi(\vec{x})$—modify only the non-zero modes and that large gauge transformations only affect the zero modes of the gauge connection $A_i(\vec{x})$. Turning the argument around, one thus concludes that the system factorizes into two types of degrees of freedom, namely the non-zero modes $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ ($n_1\neq 0$ or $n_2\neq 0$) directly related to small gauge transformations only, and the zero modes $A_i^{++}(0,0)$ directly related to large gauge transformations only. Moreover, the above expressions also show that it is always possible to set half the non-zero modes to zero by an appropriate small gauge transformation, namely either the $i=1$ or the $i=2$ component for each of the modes $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ (the choice of which of these two components is set to zero is left open for the modes with both $n_1\neq 0$ and $n_2\neq 0$, but not for those modes for which either $n_1=0$ or $n_2=0$). Consequently, invariance under small gauge transformations implies that the physical content of the system actually reduces to that of its zero mode sector $A_i^{++}(0,0)$ ($i=1,2$) only, while the physical content of its non-zero mode sector is gauge equivalent to the trivial solution $A_i(\vec{x})=0$ to the flat connection condition $F_{12}(\vec{x})=0$ associated to the vanishing holonomies $(k_1,k_2)=(0,0)$. That the physics of these systems lies entirely in their zero mode sector remains valid at the quantum level as well, as is shown hereafter (in fact, this conclusion also extends to Riemann surfaces Σ of arbitrary genus and for any choice of non-abelian gauge group G[6, 11, 12, 13, 14]).

An identical separation also applies to the modes of the gauge parameter function $\theta(\vec{x},x^0)$. As shown above, the term $(2\pi k_1x^1+2\pi k_2x^2)$ corresponds to large gauge transformations only, while the contribution $\theta_0(\vec{x},x^0)$ induces small transformations only, whose zero mode $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$ in fact completely decouples. Indeed, the latter mode corresponds to a global phase transformation, which for the real degrees of freedom $A_\mu(\vec{x},x^0)$ stands for no transformation at all. In other words, in as far as the small gauge parameter function $\theta_0(\vec{x},x^0)$ is concerned, one could say that its zero mode $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$ has in fact been traded for the (k_1,k_2) parameters characterizing the holonomies of a large gauge transformation. The zero mode $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$ for small gauge parameter functions $\theta_0(\vec{x})$ thus does not enter our considerations in any way whatsoever, and may always be set to zero. Finally, let us simply point out also that the range of each of the non-zero modes $\theta_0^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ is the entire real line, running from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ (as opposed to the zero

mode $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$ which would have taken its values in the interval $[0,2\pi]$ for example, had it contributed to gauge symmetries of the system).

It may appear that by using the mode expansion (10), the gauge field $A_i(\vec{x})$ is assumed to obey periodic boundary conditions, which would amount to implicitely assuming that $A_i(\vec{x})$ defines a vector field over T_2 rather than a possibly non trivial section of a U(1) bundle over T_2, the latter case being associated to the possibility of twisted boundary conditions for the components $A_i(\vec{x})$[20]. However, the local trivialisation of T_2 in terms of the coordinates $0 < x^1, x^2 < 1$ does not define a complete covering of T_2, which requires at least $2^2 = 4$ different overlapping coordinate charts. Moving from one chart to another implies that the gauge connection $A_i(\vec{x})$ changes also by gauge transformations which include large ones associated to twisted boundary conditions. Therefore, by explicitely considering in our definition of the gauge invariant system large gauge transformations, the possibility of twisted boundary conditions is implicitely included, and the above Fourier mode decomposition of the phase space degrees of freedom $A_i(\vec{x})$ is fully warranted.

4 Dirac Quantisation

Given the above mode decompositions of the Hamiltonian formulation of the system defined over the torus T_2, its canonical quantisation proceeds straightforwardly through the correspondence principle according to which brackets now correspond to commutation relations being set equal to the value of the bracket multiplied by $i\hbar$. Thus, given (12), the fundamental quantum operators are the modes $\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ such that

$$[\hat{A}_1^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2),\hat{A}_2^{\pm\pm}(m_1,m_2)] = \frac{2i\hbar}{N_k} f^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\delta_{n_1,m_1}\delta_{n_2,m_2} \quad , \tag{17}$$

with in particular for the zero modes,

$$\left[\hat{A}_1^{++}(0,0),\hat{A}_2^{++}(0,0)\right] = i\frac{\hbar}{2N_k} \quad . \tag{18}$$

Henceforth, we shall thus assume explicitely that $N_k > 0$, with the understanding that the case when $N_k < 0$ is then obtained simply by interchanging the rôles of the coordinates x^1 and x^2.

It is already possible at this stage to determine the number of quantum physical states[6]. Indeed, the relations (15) and (16) show that the actual gauge invariant phase space degrees of freedom are the zero modes $A_i^{++}(0,0)$ defined up to integer shifts by 2π, while half the non-zero modes—either the $i = 1$ or $i = 2$ component, depending on the given mode—may be set to zero through small gauge transformations. In other words, the actual physical phase space of the system is a two dimensional torus of volume $(2\pi)^2$, an instance of a phase space which is not a cotangent bundle as is usually the case but rather a compact manifold. The quantisation of the system thus amounts to quantising this two dimensional torus, with the commutation relation (18) in which $\hbar' = \hbar/(2N_k)$ plays the rôle of an effective Planck constant. In particular, the total number of physical states is thus given by the volume $(2\pi)^2$ of phase space divided by that of each quantum cell $(2\pi\hbar')$ for the degree of freedom $A_1^{++}(0,0)$, namely

$$\frac{(2\pi)^2}{2\pi(\hbar/2N_k)} = \frac{4\pi}{\hbar}N_k \quad . \tag{19}$$

Consequently, the normalisation factor N_k ought to be quantised with a value $N_k = \hbar k/(4\pi)$ to be associated with k physical states ($k = 1,2,\ldots$). Precisely this quantisation condition is established hereafter by considering large gauge transformations of the system; this quantisation

condition will then be specified further later on when considering modular transformations of the underlying torus T_2, which then require the integer k to also be even.

The above commutation relations for the modes $\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ define an infinite tensor product of Heisenberg algebras. In order to set up a coherent state representation through creation and annihilation operators associated to this Heisenberg algebra, it is necessary to introduce a complex structure on the initial base manifold T_2. The necessity of introducing some further structure on Σ beyond the purely topological one is also unavoidable in all other quantisation frameworks for Chern-Simons theories[6]. In fact, all other approaches require a metric structure on Σ, while it is then shown that the quantised system nevertheless depends only on the complex structure (or conformal class of the metric) on Σ, with the space of gauge invariant physical states providing a projective representation of the modular group of Σ due to a quantum conformal anomaly[6]. This is how close a topological quantum field theory may come to being purely topological. In the present approach, the necessity of introducing a complex structure over Σ is thus seen to arise from a coherent state quantisation of the system, while, in contradistinction to other quantisation methods, it is also gratifying to realise that no further structure is required within this approach since the quantised system should in any case turn out to be independent of any such additional structure.

On T_2, a complex structure is characterized through a complex parameter $\tau = \tau_1 + i\tau_2$ whose imaginary part is strictly positive, ($\tau_2 > 0$), with the modular group $PSL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ of transformations generated by ($T : \tau \to \tau + 1$) and ($S : \tau \to -1/\tau$) defining the classes of inequivalent complex structures under global diffeomeorphisms in T_2. Associated to the complex parametrisation,

$$z = x^1 + \tau x^2 \quad , \quad dz\, d\bar{z} = |dx^1 + \tau dx^2|^2 = (dx^1)^2 + 2\tau_1 dx^1 dx^2 + |\tau|^2 (dx^2)^2 \quad , \tag{20}$$

the gauge connection 1-form reads as

$$A = dx^1 A_1 + dx^2 A_2 = dz A_z + d\bar{z} A_{\bar{z}} \quad , \tag{21}$$

with

$$A_z = \frac{i}{2\tau_2}\Big[\bar{\tau} A_1 - A_2\Big] \quad , \quad A_{\bar{z}} = -\frac{i}{2\tau_2}\Big[\tau A_1 - A_2\Big] \quad . \tag{22}$$

Given the choice of complex structure parametrised by τ, the annihilation operators for the quantised system are defined by

$$\alpha^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{f^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)}\frac{N_k}{4\hbar\tau_2}}\ \Big[-i\tau \hat{A}_1^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) + i\hat{A}_2^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \quad , \tag{23}$$

with the creation operators $\alpha^{\pm\pm\dagger}(n_1,n_2)$ simply defined as the adjoint operators of $\alpha^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$. One has

$$[\alpha^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2), \alpha^{\pm\pm\dagger}(m_1,m_2)] = \delta_{n_1,m_1}\delta_{n_2,m_2} \quad , \tag{24}$$

while the annihilation (resp. creation) operators clearly correspond, up to normalisation, to the Fourier modes of $\hat{A}_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})$ (resp. $\hat{A}_z(z,\bar{z})$).

An overcomplete basis of the space of quantum states is then provided by the coherent states,

$$|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)> = \prod_{\pm\pm}\prod_{n_1,n_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|^2}\, e^{z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\alpha^{\pm\pm\dagger}(n_1,n_2)}\,|0> \quad , \tag{25}$$

with the following representation of the unit operator

$$\mathbb{1} = \int \prod_{\pm\pm}\prod_{n_1,n_2} \frac{dz^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\wedge d\bar{z}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)}{\pi}\,|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)><z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)| \quad , \tag{26}$$

where $z^{\pm\pm}(n_1, n_2)$ are arbitrary complex variables and $|0>$ is the usual Fock vacuum normalised such that $<0|0>=1$. In particular, the gauge invariant physical states of the system are those superpositions of these coherent states which are annihilated by the first-class operator $\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})$, namely by all the modes $\hat{\phi}^{\pm\pm}(n_1, n_2)$. However, this restriction does not yet account for invariance under large gauge transformations, which are not generated by the constraint operator $\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})$, a further specification to be addressed in the next section.

One could now proceed and solve for the physical state conditions $\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})|\psi>=0$ in terms of the above mode decompositions. However, we shall rather pursue the physical projector path, which will enable us to solve these conditions by at the same time also determining the wave functions of the corresponding physical states, and including the constraints which arise from the requirement of invariance under large gauge transformations as well. Nonetheless, let us note that the resolution of the physical state conditions $\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})|\psi>=0$ has been given in Ref.[11] precisely using the functional coherent state representation of the algebra of the field degrees of freedom, to which we shall thus compare our results. The approach of Ref.[11, 12] however, uses the formal manipulation and resolution of the *functional* differential equations expressing the physical state conditions in the coherent state wave function representation of the commutation relations for the field operators $\hat{A}_z(z, \bar{z})$ and $\hat{A}_{\bar{z}}(z, \bar{z})$. By working rather in terms of Fourier modes as done here in the case of the torus T_2, such formal manipulations are avoided by having only a *discrete* infinity of such operators, thus leaving only the much less critical issue of evaluating *discrete* infinite products of normalisation factors for quantum states, for which ζ-function regularisation techniques will be applied (since other regularisations would require some physical scale, hence some geometry structure to be introduced on T_2).

5 The Physical Projector

In order to construct the physical projector, which in effect projects out from any state its gauge variant components by averaging the state over all its gauge transformations and thereby leaving over its gauge invariant components only[7], let us first consider the operator which induces all finite small gauge transformations, namely $\hat{U}(\theta_0) = \exp\Big(i/\hbar \int_{T_2} d^2\vec{x}\ \theta_0(\vec{x})\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})\Big)$. In terms of the previous mode representations and definitions, one finds

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\tfrac{1}{4\pi}\sqrt{\tfrac{\tau_2}{\hbar N_k}} \int_{T_2} d^2\vec{x}\, \theta_0(\vec{x})\hat{\phi}(\vec{x}) = \\
= \ & \tfrac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \textstyle\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[+ n_2\theta_0^{+-}(0,n_2)\alpha^{++}(0,n_2)\Big] \ + \ \tfrac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty} \Big[- n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,0)\alpha^{++}(n_1,0)\Big] \ + \\
+ \ & \tfrac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \textstyle\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[- n_2\theta_0^{++}(0,n_2)\alpha^{+-}(0,n_2)\Big] \ + \ \tfrac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty} \Big[+ n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{++}(n_1,0)\alpha^{-+}(n_1,0)\Big] \ + \\
+ \ & \tfrac{1}{4} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[\Big(+ n_2\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,n_2) - n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,n_2)\Big)\alpha^{++}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \ + \\
+ \ & \tfrac{1}{4} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[\Big(- n_2\theta_0^{++}(n_1,n_2) - n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{--}(n_1,n_2)\Big)\alpha^{+-}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \ + \\
+ \ & \tfrac{1}{4} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[\Big(+ n_2\theta_0^{--}(n_1,n_2) + n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{++}(n_1,n_2)\Big)\alpha^{-+}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \ + \\
+ \ & \tfrac{1}{4} \textstyle\sum_{n_1=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{n_2=1}^{+\infty} \Big[\Big(- n_2\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,n_2) + n_1\bar{\tau}\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,n_2)\Big)\alpha^{--}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \ + \ \Big[\text{h.c.}\Big] \quad .
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

Note that, as it should, the zero mode $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$ of the gauge parameter function $\theta_0(\vec{x})$ does not appear in this expression, and that the zero mode operators $\alpha^{++(\dagger)}(0,0)$ do not contribute

either, showing once again that only small gauge transformations are generated by the first-class constraint $\phi(\vec{x})$. Moreover, it is possible to verify that the commutators of the quantity in (27) with the modes $\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ do reproduce the expressions in (15) while leaving the zero modes $\hat{A}_i^{++}(0,0)$ invariant, since we have, using the property in (43),

$$\hat{U}(\theta_0)\,\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\,\hat{U}^{-1}(\theta_0) = \hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) \,+\, \Big[\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{T_2} d^2\vec{x}\;\theta_0(\vec{x})\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})\;,\;\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\Big] \quad . \tag{28}$$

To determine how to construct the operator which generates the large gauge transformations characterized by the holonomies (k_1,k_2), let us consider the zero mode $A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)$ (a similar analysis is possible based on $A_z^{++}(0,0)$), whose gauge transformation is given by (see (16) and (22))

$$\Delta A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0) = -\frac{i}{2\tau_2}\;2\pi\Big[\tau k_1 - k_2\Big] \quad . \tag{29}$$

Consequently, the associated annihilation operator $\alpha^{++}(0,0)$ should transform according to

$$\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)\,\alpha^{++}(0,0)\,\hat{U}^{-1}(k_1,k_2) = \alpha^{++}(0,0) \;-\; 2i\pi\sqrt{\frac{N_k}{\hbar\tau_2}}\,\Big[\tau k_1 - k_2\Big] \quad , \tag{30}$$

where $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ stands for the operator generating the large gauge transformation of holonomies (k_1,k_2). Therefore, we must have

$$\hat{U}(k_1,k_2) = C(k_1,k_2)\,e^{\frac{2i\pi}{\hbar}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar N_k}{\tau_2}}\Big\{[\bar{\tau}k_1-k_2]\alpha^{++}(0,0)+[\tau k_1-k_2]\alpha^{++\dagger}(0,0)\Big\}} \quad , \tag{31}$$

where $C(k_1,k_2)$ is a cocycle factor to be determined presently such that the group composition law is obeyed for large gauge transformations,

$$\hat{U}(\ell_1,\ell_2)\,\hat{U}(k_1,k_2) = \hat{U}(\ell_1+k_1,\ell_2+k_2) \quad . \tag{32}$$

Since—using the property in (43)—the latter constraint translates into the cocycle condition

$$e^{-4i\pi^2\frac{N_k}{\hbar}[\ell_1 k_2-\ell_2 k_1]}\,C(\ell_1,\ell_2)\,C(k_1,k_2) = C(\ell_1+k_1,\ell_2+k_2) \quad , \tag{33}$$

a careful analysis shows that the unique solution to this cocycle condition is

$$N_k = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi}\,k \quad , \quad C(k_1,k_2) = e^{i\pi k k_1 k_2} \quad , \tag{34}$$

where $k = 1,2,\ldots$ is some positive integer value. This specific result for the normalisation factor N_k will thus be assumed henceforth.

These results therefore establish that consistency of the quantised system under the action of large gauge transformations in its zero mode sector $\hat{A}_i^{++}(0,0)$ requires the quantisation of the normalisation factor N_k in precisely such a manner that a total of k gauge invariant physical states are expected to exist within the entire space of quantum states generated by the coherent states constructed above. In addition, the operator $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ associated to the large gauge transformation of holonomy (k_1,k_2) is thereby totaly specified, while the operator $\hat{U}(\theta_0) = \exp\Big(i/\hbar\int_{T_2} d^2\vec{x}\,\theta_0(\vec{x})\hat{\phi}(\vec{x})\Big)$ associated to small gauge transformations of parameter function $\theta_0(\vec{x})$ is defined in (27).

Consequently, the projector onto gauge invariant physical states should simply be contructed by summing over all small and large gauge transformations the action of the operators $\hat{U}(\theta_0)$ and $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ just described. Even though this is straighforward for the large gauge

transformations, the summation over the small ones still requires some further specifications[7], stemming from the fact that the spectrum of the non-zero modes of the gauge constraint $\hat{\phi}(\vec{x}) = 0$ is continuous. Since, as was seen previously, the small gauge invariance is such that half the non-zero modes $A_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1, n_2)$ ($n_1 \neq$ or $n_2 \neq 0$) may be set to zero, the other half being their conjugate phase space variables, let us discuss this specific issue in the following much simpler situation.

Consider a single degree of freedom system with coordinate $\hat{q}$ and conjugate momentum $\hat{p}$, both hermitian operators, whose commutation relation is the usual Heisenberg algebra $[\hat{q}, \hat{p}] = i$, and subject to the first-class constraint $\hat{q} = 0$. The spectrum of this latter operator being continuous, the proper definition of a projector onto the states satisfying this constraint requires to consider rather the projector onto those states whose $\hat{q}$ eigenvalues lie within some interval $[-\delta, \delta]$, $\delta > 0$ being a parameter whose value may be as small as may be required[7]. The latter projector is expressed as,

$$\mathbb{E}_\delta \equiv \mathbb{E}[-\delta < q < \delta] = \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} dq \, |q><q| = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\xi \, e^{i\xi\hat{q}} \, \frac{\sin(\xi\delta)}{\pi\xi} \quad , \tag{35}$$

assuming that the position eigenstates are normalised such that $< q_1|q_2 >= \delta(q_1 - q_2)$. By construction, one has the required properties,

$$\mathbb{E}_\delta^2 = \mathbb{E}_\delta \quad , \quad \mathbb{E}_\delta^\dagger = \mathbb{E}_\delta \quad . \tag{36}$$

However, one would rather wish to consider the operator singling out the $|q = 0 >$ component of any state, namely,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 = |q = 0><q = 0| \quad . \tag{37}$$

Even though this operator is indeed hermitian, it is not strictly in involution since one has,

$$\mathbb{E}_0^2 = \delta(0) \, \mathbb{E}_0 \quad . \tag{38}$$

In other words, since the position eigenstates of the $\hat{q}$ operators are non normalisable, the operator $\mathbb{E}_0$ does not define a projection operator in a strict sense, since even though it projects onto the $|q = 0 >$ component, it leads thereby to a non normalisable state satisfying the constraint $\hat{q} = 0$. Nevertheless, the non normalisable projector $\mathbb{E}_0$ may be constructed from the well defined one $\mathbb{E}_\delta$ through the following limit,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{2\delta} \, \mathbb{E}_\delta = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\xi}{2\pi} \, e^{i\xi\hat{q}} \quad . \tag{39}$$

Hence, associated to the choice of normalisation of position eigenstates $< q_1|q_2 >= \delta(q_1 - q_2)$, the non normalisable projector $\mathbb{E}_0$ onto the states such that $\hat{q}|\psi >= 0$ is simply represented by the integral operator on the r.h.s. of this last identity.

Transcribing these considerations to the U(1) Chern-Simons theory, it should be clear that the (non normalisable) projector onto the (non normalisable) gauge invariant physical states of the system is simply given by (recall that the modes $\theta_0^{++}(0,0)$, $\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,0)$, $\theta_0^{-+}(0,n_2)$, $\theta_0^{--}(n_1,0)$ and $\theta_0^{--}(0,n_2)$ are non existent)

$$\mathbb{E}_0 = \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{U}(k_1,k_2) \prod_{\pm\pm} \prod_{n_1,n_2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\theta_0^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)}{2\pi} \, \hat{U}(\theta_0) \quad . \tag{40}$$

Note that this physical projector also defines the physical evolution operator of the system, since the first-class Hamiltonian operator vanishes identically, $\hat{H} = 0$, a consequence of invariance under local coordinate transformations in Σ.

6 Gauge Invariant Physical States

The set of physical states of the system should now be identifiable simply by applying the physical projector $\mathbb{E}_0$ onto the entire space of states representing the operator algebra of modes $\hat{A}_i^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$. Working in the basis (25) of coherent states $|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)>$, this is tantamount to considering the diagonal matrix elements $< z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|\mathbb{E}_0|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)>$, since these matrix elements simply reduce to a sum of the physical state contributions as intermediate states, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} < z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|\mathbb{E}_0|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) > &= \sum_r < z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|r >< r|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) > \\ &= \sum_r |< r|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >|^2 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where r is a discrete or continuous index labelling all physical states (only a finite number k of which are expected, of course). Therefore, when having obtained an expression for the diagonal matrix elements $< z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|\mathbb{E}_0|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >$ as a sum of modulus squared quantities, the physical states of the system together with their coherent state wave function representations are readily identified up to a physically irrelevant phase factor, knowing that except for the factor $e^{-|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|^2/2}$ for each mode stemming from the normalisation of the coherent states, the wave functions $< r|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >$ are necessarily functions of the variables $z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ only, but not of their complex conjugate values $\bar{z}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$. Had the system possessed some global symmetry beyond the U(1) gauge invariance, the associated different quantum numbers of the physical states could have used to label them, thereby making it easier to identify them as well as their wave functions from the above matrix elements suitably extended to include the action of the global symmetry generators[9]. Note also that trying to extract the same information—beginning with the number of physical states—from the partition function $\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathbb{E}_0$ would be problematic. Indeed, that latter quantity is ill-defined since neither the physical states $|r>$ nor the physical projector $\mathbb{E}_0$ are normalisable quantities.

Given that the exponential arguments appearing in the definition of the gauge operators $\hat{U}(\theta_0)$ and $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ are linear in the creation and annihilation operators $\alpha^{\pm\pm(\dagger)}(n_1,n_2)$, the explicit evaluation of the above diagonal coherent state matrix elements of the physical projector $\mathbb{E}_0$ is rather straighforward even though not immediate for the modes with $n_1 \neq 0$ and $n_2 \neq 0$. Let us only give the outline of the calculation for the modes with $n_1 = 0$ or $n_2 = 0$. That for the modes with $n_1 \neq 0$ and $n_2 \neq 0$ is similar but involves some matrix algebra since the integrations over $\theta_0^{++}(n_1,n_2)$ and $\theta_0^{--}(n_1,n_2)$ on the one hand, and $\theta_0^{+-}(n_1,n_2)$ and $\theta_0^{-+}(n_1,n_2)$ on the other, are coupled to one another in each case.

Consider again a single degree of freedom system with creation and annihilation operators $a^\dagger$ and a, respectively, such that $[a,a^\dagger]=1$, together with the associated coherent states

$$|z>= e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}\, e^{za^\dagger}\,|0> \quad , \quad < z|z >= 1 \quad , \tag{42}$$

$|0>$ being the usual Fock vacuum normalised as $<0|0>=1$. Using the identity

$$e^{A+B} = e^{-\frac{1}{2}[A,B]}\, e^A\, e^B \quad , \tag{43}$$

valid for any two operators A and B which commute with their commutator $[A,B]$, as well as the obvious properties that

$$a\,|z>= z\,|z> \quad , \quad e^{i\lambda\theta a}\,|z>= e^{i\lambda\theta z}\,|z> \quad , \tag{44}$$

where λ and θ are arbitrary real and complex variables, respectively (in keeping with the notation in (27)), one readily concludes that diagonal coherent state matrix elements of an exponential

operator whose argument is linear in the creation and annihilation operators are simply given by

$$< z|e^{i\lambda[\theta a+\bar{\theta}a^\dagger]}|z >= e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2|\theta|^2}\, e^{i\lambda\bar{\theta}\bar{z}}\, e^{i\lambda\theta z} \quad . \tag{45}$$

Consequently, in the case of the matrix elements $< z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|\mathbb{E}_0|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >$, the integrations over the discrete infinite number of non-zero modes $\theta_0^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ ($n_1 \neq 0$ or $n_2 \neq 0$, or both) for small gauge transformations simply correspond to gaussian integrals for each of these contributions, whose results are then multiplied with one another. As mentioned previously, the ensuing discrete infinite products of normalisation factors are handled using ζ-function regularisation techniques, rendering these products well defined. Moreover, the discrete infinite products of the remaining gaussian factors may be expressed as a simple exponential whose argument is given by the integral over the torus T_2 of a local quantity built from the modes $z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ defining the coherent state $|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >$ for which the diagonal matrix element is evaluated.

Similar considerations apply to the contribution from the zero mode sector $z^{++}(0,0)$, but the summation over the holonomies (k_1,k_2) is such that no clear separation of terms in the form of (41), corresponding to the separate contributions of the distinct physical states, appears to be feasable. In fact, the evaluation of the zero mode sector contribution to the relevant matrix elements requires an entirely different approach, which is detailed in the Appendix and uses different representations of the zero mode algebra (18). In particular, it is shown in the Appendix that the total number of physical states is indeed equal to the value of the integer k which quantises the normalisation factor N_k in (34), so that the index r introduced in (41) takes the following finite set of values, $r = 0, 1, \ldots, (k-1)$.

In order to give the final result of all these calculations in a convenient form, let us introduce the following quantities associated to the complex parameters $z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ (see (22) and (23))

$$A_{\bar{z}}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) = \sqrt{f^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)\,\frac{4\pi}{k\tau_2}}\;\; z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) \quad , \tag{46}$$

thereby determining a specific function $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})$ through its mode expansion. In turn, let us then introduce the further modes defined in terms of those of $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi^{++}(n_1,n_2) &= i\tfrac{\tau_2}{\pi}\,\tfrac{-n_2 A_{\bar{z}}^{+-}(n_1,n_2)-n_1\tau A_{\bar{z}}^{-+}(n_1,n_2)}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2} \quad , \\
\chi^{+-}(n_1,n_2) &= i\tfrac{\tau_2}{\pi}\,\tfrac{+n_2 A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(n_1,n_2)-n_1\tau A_{\bar{z}}^{--}(n_1,n_2)}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2} \quad , \\
\chi^{-+}(n_1,n_2) &= i\tfrac{\tau_2}{\pi}\,\tfrac{+n_1\tau A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(n_1,n_2)-n_2 A_{\bar{z}}^{--}(n_1,n_2)}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2} \quad , \\
\chi^{--}(n_1,n_2) &= i\tfrac{\tau_2}{\pi}\,\tfrac{+n_1\tau A_{\bar{z}}^{+-}(n_1,n_2)+n_2 A_{\bar{z}}^{-+}(n_1,n_2)}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2} \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

with again the understanding that the zero mode $\chi^{++}(0,0) = 0$ is taken to vanish, and that the would-be non-zero modes $\chi^{+-}(n_1,0)$, $\chi^{-+}(0,n_2)$, $\chi^{--}(n_1,0)$ and $\chi^{--}(0,n_2)$ ($n_1,n_2 = 1,2,\ldots$) do not appear in the mode expansions.

Correspondingly, the modes of the functions $\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi(z,\bar{z})$ and $\partial_z\chi(z,\bar{z})$ are such that on the one hand

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi(z,\bar{z}) = A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) - A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0) \quad , \tag{48}$$

namely that all modes of $\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi(z,\bar{z})$ except for the zero mode $(\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)^{++}(0,0) = 0$ coincide with the corresponding ones of $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})$, and on the other hand the non-zero modes of $\partial_z\chi(z,\bar{z})$ are

given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\partial_z\chi)^{++}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{-1}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2}\left\{\left[n_1^2|\tau|^2-n_2^2\right]A_{\bar z}^{++}(n_1,n_2)+n_1n_2(\tau-\bar\tau)A_{\bar z}^{--}(n_1,n_2)\right\} \quad ,\\
(\partial_z\chi)^{+-}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{-1}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2}\left\{\left[n_1^2|\tau|^2-n_2^2\right]A_{\bar z}^{+-}(n_1,n_2)-n_1n_2(\tau-\bar\tau)A_{\bar z}^{-+}(n_1,n_2)\right\} \quad ,\\
(\partial_z\chi)^{-+}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{-1}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2}\left\{-n_1n_2(\tau-\bar\tau)A_{\bar z}^{+-}(n_1,n_2)+\left[n_1^2|\tau|^2-n_2^2\right]A_{\bar z}^{-+}(n_1,n_2)\right\} \quad ,\\
(\partial_z\chi)^{--}(n_1,n_2) &= \tfrac{-1}{n_1^2\tau^2-n_2^2}\left\{+n_1n_2(\tau-\bar\tau)A_{\bar z}^{++}(n_1,n_2)+\left[n_1^2|\tau|^2-n_2^2\right]A_{\bar z}^{--}(n_1,n_2)\right\} \quad .
\end{aligned}
\tag{49}
$$

An important identity that the modes of the function $\chi(z,\bar z)$ satisfy is the functional relation

$$
\partial_{\bar z}\left(\partial_z\chi\right)=\partial_z A_{\bar z}=\partial_z\left(\partial_{\bar z}\chi\right) \quad . \tag{50}
$$

In terms of these different quantities, finally the coherent state wave function for each of the k physical states $|r>$ of the system is given by ($r=0,1,2,\ldots,k-1$),

$$
\begin{aligned}
<r|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)> &\equiv <r|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)>\\
&= e^{-\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi}\left(A_{\bar z}^{++}(0,0)\right)^2}\ \tfrac{1}{\eta(\tau)}\ \Theta\begin{bmatrix} r/k \\ 0\end{bmatrix}\Big(-i\tfrac{k\tau_2}{\pi}A_{\bar z}^{++}(0,0)\Big|k\tau\Big)\times\\
&\times\ e^{-\frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_{T_2}dz\wedge d\bar z\,|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)|^2}\ e^{\frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_{T_2}dz\wedge d\bar z\,\partial_{\bar z}\chi(z,\bar z)\partial_z\chi(z,\bar z)} \quad ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{51}
$$

where $\eta(\tau)$ is the Dedekind η-function, $\eta=e^{i\pi\tau/12}\prod_{n=1}^{+\infty}(1-e^{2i\pi n\tau})$, Θ is the torus θ-function with characteristics whose definition is given in the Appendix, while the physically irrelevant overall phase factor is set to unity. Note that in the last two exponential factors, the integral $\int_{T_2}dz\wedge d\bar z\,|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)|^2$ does include the contribution $\exp\left(-k\tau_2|A_{\bar z}^{++}(0,0)|^2/(2\pi)\right)$ from the zero mode component $A_{\bar z}^{++}(0,0)$ of the coherent state $|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)>$, in contradistinction to the second integral $\int_{T_2}dz\wedge d\bar z\partial_{\bar z}\chi(z,\bar z)\partial_z\chi(z,\bar z)$ which only includes contributions from the non-zero modes $A_{\bar z}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ ($n_1\neq 0$ or $n_2\neq 0$). This point is important when checking gauge and modular invariance properties of these physical wave functions.

These wave functions coincide with those established in Ref.[11] by using a functional representation of the commutations relations of the field degrees of freedom $A_i(\vec x)$ in order to solve for the physical state condition $\hat\phi(\vec x)=0$ as well as requiring invariance under large gauge transformations. This identity of results thus demonstrates that the physical projector approach is indeed capable, without any gauge fixing procedure whatsoever and thereby avoiding the possibility of any Gribov problem, to properly identify the actual gauge invariant content of a system, even when this requires the projection down to only a finite number of components from an initially infinite number of states.

By construction, the states whose coherent state wave functions are given in (51) are invariant under both large and small gauge transformations. However, this property does not necessarily imply that the wave functions themselves are invariant under arbitrary gauge transformations of the variables $A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)$. To make this point explicit, let us consider the gauge transformations of the physical states, whose invariance should thus imply the following identities,

$$
\begin{aligned}
<r|\hat U^{-1}(\theta_0)|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)> &= <r|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)> \quad ,\\
<r|\hat U^{-1}(k_1,k_2)|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)> &= <r|A_{\bar z}(z,\bar z)> \quad ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{52}
$$

valid both for small and large gauge transformations $\hat{U}(\theta_0)$ and $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ whatever the values of their modes $\theta_0^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ or their holonomies (k_1,k_2).

In the case of small gauge transformations, a careful analysis of the contributions to the relevant matrix elements establishes the result,

$$\hat{U}^{-1}(\theta_0)|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})>= e^{-\frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_{T_2} dz\wedge d\bar{z}\left[\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi\partial_z\theta_0-\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta_0\overline{\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi}\right]}\ |A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})+\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta_0(z,\bar{z})> \quad , \tag{53}$$

as well as

$$< r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})+\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta_0(z,\bar{z})>= e^{-\frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_{T_2} dz\wedge d\bar{z}\left[(A_{\bar{z}}-\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)\partial_z\theta_0+\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta_0(\overline{A_{\bar{z}}}-\partial_z\chi)\right]}\ < r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})> \quad , \tag{54}$$

where $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})+\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi(z,\bar{z})$ stands for the transformations of the modes $A_{\bar{z}}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ under the small gauge transformation $\theta_0(\vec{x})$ of modes $\theta_0^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$, with of course the understanding that the zero mode $A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)$ is left invariant.

Combining these two relations and using the identity in (50) after integration by parts in the exponential factors (to which the zero mode $A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)$ does not contribute), the first identity in (52) then indeed follows, thereby confirming gauge invariance of the physical states under small gauge transformations.

Similarly for a large gauge transformation $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ of holonomies (k_1,k_2), one finds,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{U}^{-1}(k_1,k_2) \quad & |A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})>= \\ &= \ e^{i\pi k k_1 k_2}\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}ik\left[(k_1\tau-k_2)\overline{A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)}+(k_1\bar{\tau}-k_2)A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)\right]}\ |A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})-\tfrac{i\pi}{\tau_2}(\tau k_1-k_2)> \quad ,\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

as well as

$$< r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})-\frac{i\pi}{\tau_2}(\tau k_1-k_2)>= e^{-i\pi k k_1 k_2}\, e^{\frac{1}{2}ik\left[(k_1\tau-k_2)\overline{A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)}+(k_1\bar{\tau}-k_2)A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)\right]}\ < r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})> \ , \tag{56}$$

where this time $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})-i\pi(\tau k_1-k_2)/\tau_2$ stands for the transformation of the modes $A_{\bar{z}}^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)$ under the large gauge transformation of holonomies (k_1,k_2) which of course affects only the zero mode $A_{\bar{z}}^{++}(0,0)$ by the indicated constant shift linear in k_1 and k_2. Consequently, these two relations also lead to the the second identity in (52), thereby establishing gauge invariance of the physical states under large gauge transformations as well.

These relations also demonstrate that in spite of the gauge invariance of the physical states $|r>$ $(r=0,1,\ldots,k-1)$ under small and large transformations, $\hat{U}(\theta_0)|r>=|r>$ and $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|r>=|r>$, their coherent state wave functions $< r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})>$ are not invariant by themselves under the simple substitution of the gauge variation of their argument $A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})$, namely the variations $A'_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) = A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})+\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi(z,\bar{z})$ for small gauge transformations and $A'_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) = A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z})-i\pi(\tau k_1-k_2)/\tau_2$ for large ones.

Let us now turn to the issue of modular invariance of the physical content of the quantised system. If indeed this content depends only on the complex structure—parametrised by the variable τ—as the only structure necessary beyond the mere topological one of the underlying torus T_2, the spectrum of physical states should remain invariant under the modular group $PSL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ of T_2 which is generated by the transformations

$$T \ : \quad \tau\to\tau+1 \quad , \quad S \ : \quad \tau\to-\frac{1}{\tau} \quad . \tag{57}$$

Indeed, these transformations correspond to global diffeomorphisms—namely Dehn twists—in the local trivialisation of T_2 characterized through the choice of holonomy basis (a,b) and the

associated coordinates $0 < x^1, x^2 < 1$, and these modular transformations define equivalences classes for the values of τ which correspond to a same complex structure (or conformal class) on T_2.

An explicit analysis of the transformation properties of the physical wave functions (51) shows that the requirement of invariance of the physical content of the system under the T modular transformation is met only if the integer k *also takes an even value* (see the Appendix)[11], in which case one finds,

$$T \ : \ \ < r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) > \ \rightarrow \ e^{-i\pi/12}\, e^{i\pi r^2/k} \ < r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) > \quad . \tag{58}$$

On the other hand, invariance under the S modular transformation is realised through the transformations,

$$S \ : \quad \tau \ \rightarrow \ \tilde{\tau} = -\frac{1}{\tau} \quad , \quad A^{++}_{\bar{z}}(0,0) \ \rightarrow \ \tilde{A}^{++}_{\bar{z}}(0,0) = -\bar{\tau} A^{++}_{\bar{z}}(0,0) \quad , \tag{59}$$

while the non-zero modes $A^{\pm\pm}_{\bar{z}}(n_1,n_2)$ are left unchanged, in which case one has (see the Appendix),

$$S \ : \ \ < r|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) >_\tau \ \rightarrow \ < r|\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) >_{\tilde{\tau}} = \sum_{r'=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\, e^{2i\pi r r'/k} \ < r'|A_{\bar{z}}(z,\bar{z}) >_\tau \quad . \tag{60}$$

Hence, in addition to the quantisation condition $N_k = \hbar k/(4\pi)$ imposed on the normalisation factor N_k by the requirement of invariance under large gauge transformations, modular invariance of the theory requires also that the integer k be even[11]. In this case the space of quantum physical states does provide an irreducible representation of the T_2 modular group, showing that the physical content of the system does indeed depend only on the choice of complex structure (or conformal class) on T_2 characterized through the equivalence class under the modular group of the parameter τ. Nevertheless, physical states are not individually modular invariant, but rather they define a projective representation of the modular group. This is how close the quantised U(1) Chern-Simons theory is to being a purely topological quantum field theory, the dependency on a complex structure on T_2 following from the existence of a conformal anomaly at the quantum level[6].

7 Conclusions

This paper has demonstrated that the new approach to the quantisation of gauge invariant systems[7], based on the physical projector onto the subspace of gauge invariant states, is perfectly adequate to handle the intricacies of topological quantum fields theories, in which only a finite set of physical states is to remain after the infinity of gauge variant configurations has been projected away. This new approach to the quantisation of constrained systems does not require any gauge fixing procedure whatsoever and is thus free of any potential Gribov ambiguity in the case of gauge symmetries[8], in contradistinction to all other quantisation frameworks for gauge invariant systems. Another of its advantages is that the physical projector approach to the quantisation of such theories is directly set simply within Dirac's formulation, where it finds its natural place. In particular, the physical projector enables the construction of the physical evolution operator of such systems, to which only physical states contribute as intermediate states, so that the physical content may be identified directly from the matrix elements of that evolution operator, including the wave functions of physical states. For topological field theories, since these systems are invariant under local diffeomorphisms in the base manifold, their gauge

invariant Hamiltonian vanishes identically, in which case the evolution operator coincides with the physical projector.

More specifically, the physical projector approach was applied to the U(1) pure Chern-Simons theory in 2+1 dimensions in a space whose topology is that of $\mathbb{R} \times T_2$, T_2 being an arbitrary two dimensional torus. Through a careful analysis of the quantised system, of the relevant physical projector, and in particular of the specific discrete infinite mode content of the system, it has been possible to identify and construct the physical spectrum and the coherent state wave functions of the gauge invariant states, leading to results which are in complete agreement with those of other approaches to the quantisation of the same system[6, 11, 12, 13, 14], while also avoiding some of complications or formal manipulations inherent to these other approaches. The only more or less ad-hoc but unavoidable feature which is introduced in our analysis is that the discrete infinite products—rather than continuous ones as occurs in functional representations—of gaussian normalisation factors have been evaluated using ζ-function regularisation, which avoids having to introduce any other structure on the underlying two dimensional Riemann surface beyond those associated already to the topology and complex structure (or conformal class) of that surface. This is in keeping with the fact that the quantised theory only depends on that complex structure but no other structure beyond it (even when one is introduced, namely through a metric structurec[6]), while also a dependency on the complex structure rather than purely the topology of the underlying manifold is the unavoidable consequence of the quantisation of the system[6]. In particular, it was shown how gauge invariance under large gauge transformations implies a quantisation rule for the overall normalisation of the classical Chern-Simons action in terms of an integer equal to the number of physical states, which in turn is also required to be even for modular invariance to be realised[11]. When both these restrictions are met, the quantised system indeed only depends on the complex structure introduced on the underlying Riemann surface.

These systems are also distinguished by the fact that their physical phase space is a compact manifold, in the present instance with the topology of a two dimensional torus, which is in contradistinction to the ordinary situation in which the phase space of a given system is a cotangent bundle. Usually, geometric quantisation techniques are then invoked in order to address the specific issues raised by a phase space having a compact topology[21]. Nevertheless, no such techniques were introduced here, but rather by properly identifying the operator which generates the transformations responsible for such a compact topology of phase space—in the present instance large gauge transformations—, it was possible to properly represent the consequences of such a circumstance using straightforward coherent state techniques of ordinary quantum mechanics. Clearly, similar considerations based on the construction of the relevant projection operator are of application to any system whose phase space includes a compact manifold which is an homogeneous coset space G/H, G and H being compact Lie algebras. From that point of view, it may well be worthwhile to explore the potential of the physical projector as an alternative to geometric quantisation techniques.

The physical projector approach is thus quite an efficient approach to the quantisation of gauge invariant systems, which does not require any gauge fixing procedure whatsoever and thus avoids the potential Gribov problems inherent to such procedures. Some of its advantages have been illustrated here in the instance of the U(1) Chern-Simons theory, as well as for some simple gauge invariant quantum mechanical systems elsewhere[9, 10]. Hence, it appears timely now to start exploring the application[22] of this alternative method to the quantisation of gauge invariant systems of more direct physical interest, within the context of the recent developments surrounding M-theory compactified to low dimensions, and aiming beyond that towards the gauge invariant theories of the fundamental interactions among the elementary quantum excitations in the natural Universe.

Acknowledgments

Prof. John Klauder is gratefully acknowledged for useful conversations concerning the physical projector, and for his constant interest in this work. This work is part of the undergraduate Diploma Thesis of B.D.

Appendix

This Appendix outlines the calculation of the contribution of the zero mode sector to the coherent state diagonal matrix elements $< z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2)|\mathbb{E}_0|z^{\pm\pm}(n_1,n_2) >$ of the physical projector operator, namely the quantity

$$\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} < z|\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|z >= \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} < z|e^{i\pi k k_1 k_2}\, e^{i\sqrt{\frac{\pi k}{\tau_2}}\left\{[\bar{\tau}k_1-k_2]\alpha+[\tau k_1-k_2]\alpha^\dagger\right\}}|z > \quad . \quad (61)$$

Here, z, α and $\alpha^\dagger$ stand of course for the zero mode sector only, with the obvious understanding that usual indices distinguishing these zero modes, such as $z^{++}(0,0)$, are not explicitely displayed in this Appendix.

Since the evaluation of these matrix elements requires changes of bases for different representations of the associated quantum algebra, let us recall here the relations between the different quantum operators appearing in this sector of the system. One has the definitions

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi\tau_2}}\left[-i\tau\hat{A}_1 + i\hat{A}_2\right] \quad , \quad \alpha^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi\tau_2}}\left[i\bar{\tau}\hat{A}_1 - i\hat{A}_2\right] \quad , \quad (62)$$

while the corresponding commutation rules are

$$\left[\hat{A}_1,\hat{A}_2\right] = \frac{2i\pi}{k} \quad , \quad \left[\alpha,\alpha^\dagger\right] = 1 \quad , \quad (63)$$

with the implicit understanding that both $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$ are hermitian operators. Using these relations as well as the identity in (43), large gauge transformations also read as

$$\hat{U}(k_1,k_2) = \; e^{i\pi k k_1 k_2}\, e^{ik\left[k_1\hat{A}_2 - k_2\hat{A}_1\right]} = \; e^{ikk_1\hat{A}_2}\, e^{-ikk_2\hat{A}_1} \quad . \quad (64)$$

Since the algebra for the modes $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$ is that of the usual Heisenberg algebra, with $\hat{A}_1$ playing the rôle of the configuration space coordinate and $\hat{A}_2$ that of the conjugate momentum variable, it is clear from the above last expression of the operator $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ in terms of these modes that the mixed configuration-momentum space matrix elements of $\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$ are readily obtained. Hence, let us develop the different representations of the commutations relations (63), namely the configuration space, the momentum space and the coherent state ones.

Configuration and momentum space representations correspond to eigenstates $|A_1>$ and $|A_2>$ of the $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$ operators, respectively,

$$\hat{A}_1|A_1 >= A_1|A_1 > \quad , \quad \hat{A}_2|A_2 >= A_2|A_2 > \quad , \quad (65)$$

whose normalisation is chosen to be such that

$$< A_1|A_1' >= \delta(A_1 - A_1') \quad , \quad < A_2|A_2' >= \delta(A_2 - A_2') \quad , \quad (66)$$

to which the following representations of the identity operator are thus associated

$$\mathbb{1} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dA_1\, |A_1 >< A_1| \quad , \quad \mathbb{1} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dA_2\, |A_2 >< A_2| \quad . \quad (67)$$

Since the factor $\hbar' = 2\pi/k$ plays the rôle of an effective Planck constant, it is clear that the configuration space wave function representations of the two operators $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$ are simply,

$$< A_1|\hat{A}_1|\psi >= A_1 \; < A_1|\psi > \quad , \quad < A_1|\hat{A}_2|\psi >= -\frac{2i\pi}{k}\frac{\partial}{\partial A_1} \; < A_1|\psi > \quad , \quad (68)$$

and for the momentum space wave function representations,

$$< A_2|\hat{A}_1|\psi >= \frac{2i\pi}{k}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial A_2}\,< A_2|\psi > \quad , \quad < A_2|\hat{A}_2|\psi >= A_2\,< A_2|\psi > \quad . \tag{69}$$

In particular, given the above choice of normalisation, we have for the matrix elements expressing the corresponding changes of basis,

$$< A_2|A_1 >= \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi}\,e^{-\frac{ik}{2\pi}A_1A_2} \quad , \quad < A_1|A_2 >= \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi}\,e^{+\frac{ik}{2\pi}A_1A_2} \quad . \tag{70}$$

Let us now consider the Fock state representation of the same quantum algebra, whose set of orthonormalised basis vectors is thus defined by

$$|n >= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}\,\left(\alpha^\dagger\right)^n\,|0> \quad , \tag{71}$$

$|0>$ being of course the Fock vacuum normalised such that $< 0|0 >= 1$. Given the above configuration space representation, the configuration space wave functions of the Fock basis vectors are easily constructed. For the vacuum, one finds from the condition $\alpha|0 >= 0$, including proper normalisation,

$$< A_1|0 >= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2}\right)^{1/4}\,e^{\frac{ik}{4\pi}\tau A_1^2} \quad , \tag{72}$$

while the excited Fock states are such that

$$< A_1|n >= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2}\right)^{1/4}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}\,\left(\frac{i\bar{\tau}}{2\tau_2}\right)^{n/2}\,\left[u-\frac{d}{du}\right]^n\,e^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{\tau}{\bar{\tau}}u^2} \quad , \quad u=\sqrt{\frac{ik\bar{\tau}}{2\pi}}\,A_1 \quad . \tag{73}$$

In order to solve for these latter expressions, let us introduce polynomials $P_n(u;\lambda)$ generalising the usual Hermite polynomials, and defined by the generating function

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\lambda)t^2+(1+\lambda)tu}=\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty}\,\frac{t^n}{n!}\,P_n(u;\lambda) \quad , \tag{74}$$

where λ is a complex parameter. These polynomials satisfy the following set of properties,

$$P_n(u;\lambda)=e^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda u^2}\,\left[u-\frac{d}{du}\right]^n\,e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda u^2} \quad , \tag{75}$$

$$P_{n+1}(u;\lambda)=(1+\lambda)uP_n(u;\lambda)-\frac{d}{du}P_n(u;\lambda) \quad , \tag{76}$$

$$P_0(u;\lambda)=1 \quad , \quad P_1(u;\lambda)=(1+\lambda)u \quad . \tag{77}$$

Hence finally, one finds

$$< A_1|n >= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2}\right)^{1/4}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}\,\left(\frac{i\bar{\tau}}{2\tau_2}\right)^{n/2}\,e^{\frac{ik\tau}{4\pi}A_1^2}\,P_n\left(\sqrt{\frac{ik\bar{\tau}}{2\pi}}\,A_1;\frac{-i\tau}{i\bar{\tau}}\right) \quad . \tag{78}$$

Similarly for the momentum wave functions, one has

$$< A_2|n >= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2|\tau|^2}\right)^{1/4}\,\frac{(-i)^n}{\sqrt{n!}}\,\left(\frac{i\bar{\tau}}{2\tau_2}\right)^{n/2}\,e^{\frac{k}{4i\pi\tau}A_2^2}\,P_n\left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{2i\pi\bar{\tau}}}\,A_2;\frac{i\bar{\tau}}{-i\tau}\right) \quad . \tag{79}$$

Finally, let us consider the coherent state basis,

$$|z>= e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}\, e^{z\alpha^\dagger}\,|0> \quad , \quad \mathbb{1} = \int \frac{dz\wedge d\bar{z}}{\pi}\,|z><z| \quad . \tag{80}$$

Using the relations

$$\alpha|z>= z|z> \quad , \quad <n|z>= \frac{z^n}{\sqrt{n!}}\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2} \quad , \tag{81}$$

as well as the above generating function for the polynomials $P_n(u;\lambda)$ which appear in the matrix elements $<A_1|n>$ and $<A_2|n>$, the following results are readily obtained,

$$<A_1|z>= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2}\right)^{1/4}\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}\, e^{\frac{ik\tau}{4\pi}A_1^2}\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2+zA_1\sqrt{\frac{k\tau_2}{\pi}}} \quad , \tag{82}$$

$$<A_2|z>= \left(\frac{k\tau_2}{2\pi^2|\tau|^2}\right)^{1/4}\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}\, e^{\frac{k}{4i\pi\tau}A_2^2}\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{i\bar{\tau}}{-i\tau}z^2+\frac{zA_2}{\tau}\sqrt{\frac{k\tau_2}{\pi}}} \quad . \tag{83}$$

Having established these different changes of bases, let us return to the evaluation of the matrix element (61). Obviously, given (64), the mixed configuration-momentum space matrix elements are simply,

$$<A_2|\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1>= \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi}\, e^{ikk_1A_2}\, e^{-ikk_2A_1}\, e^{-\frac{ik}{2\pi}A_1A_2} \quad . \tag{84}$$

Using the identities

$$\sum_{k_1=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{ikk_1A_2} = \sum_{n_1=-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{2\pi}{k}\delta\left(A_2-\frac{2\pi n_1}{k}\right) \quad , \tag{85}$$

$$\sum_{k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-ikk_2A_1} = \sum_{n_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{2\pi}{k}\delta\left(A_1-\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}\right) \quad , \tag{86}$$

one also has

$$<A_2|\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1>= \frac{2\pi}{k}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\sum_{n_1,n_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{k}n_1n_2}\,\delta\left(A_2-\frac{2\pi n_1}{k}\right)\,\delta\left(A_1-\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}\right) \quad . \tag{87}$$

However, in this form it is not yet possible to identify the different contributions of the physical states in the form of modulus squared terms. In order to achieve that aim, let us finally compute the configuration space matrix elements of the relevant operator, using the change of basis $<A_1|A_2>$ above. One then obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} &<A_1|\textstyle\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1'>= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dA_2\; <A_1|A_2><A_2|\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1'> \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{k}\sum_{n_2=-\infty}^{+\infty}\left[\delta\left(A_1'-\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}\right)\,\sum_{n_1=-\infty}^{+\infty}\delta\left(A_1-\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}-2\pi n_1\right)\right] \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Having thus obtained the configuration space matrix elements of the zero mode physical projector operator, let us finally apply it onto any state of this sector of the quantised system. Introducing the configuration space wave function

$$|\psi>= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dA_1\,|A_1><A_1|\psi>= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dA_1\,|A_1>\,\psi(A_1) \quad , \quad \psi(A_1)\equiv<A_1|\psi> \quad , \tag{89}$$

one readily derives,

$$< A_1| \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|\psi >= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dA_1' \ < A_1| \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1' >< A_1'|\psi >$$

$$= \ \frac{2\pi}{k} \sum_{n_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \Big[\psi\Big(\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}\Big) \sum_{n_1=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta\Big(A_1 - \frac{2\pi n_2}{k} - 2\pi n_1\Big)\Big] \quad . \tag{90}$$

In particular, since physical states are to be invariant under the action of the physical projector $\sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{U}(k_1,k_2)$, they should thus obey the following equation,

$$\frac{2\pi}{k} \sum_{n_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \Big[\psi\Big(\frac{2\pi n_2}{k}\Big) \sum_{n_1=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta\Big(A_1 - \frac{2\pi n_2}{k} - 2\pi n_1\Big)\Big] = \psi(A_1) \quad . \tag{91}$$

However, since this equation possesses k distinct linearly independent solutions given by

$$< A_1|r >= \psi_r(A_1) = \frac{2\pi}{k} C_r \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta\Big(A_1 - \frac{2\pi r}{k} - 2\pi n\Big) \quad , \quad r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1 \quad , \tag{92}$$

where C_r is some normalisation factor, it is clear that there are exactly k distinct physical states $|r>$ for the quantised U(1) Chern-Simons theory whose action is normalised with the factor $N_k = \hbar k/(4\pi)$. Moreover, the normalisation C_r for each of these configuration space wave functions of physical states is obtained from the obvious condition,

$$< A_1| \sum_{k_1,k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{U}(k_1,k_2)|A_1' >= \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} < A_1|r >< r|A_1' > \quad . \tag{93}$$

The explicit resolution of this last constraint then finally provides the following configuration space wave functions for the k physical states $|r>$ $(r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1)$,

$$< A_1|r >= \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{k}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta\Big(A_1 - \frac{2\pi r}{k} - 2\pi n\Big) \quad . \tag{94}$$

The coherent state wave functions $< r|z >$ of the same states are then easily obtained, using the associated change of basis specified by the quantities $< A_1|z >$, namely

$$< r|z >= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dA_1 \ < r|A_1 >< A_1|z > \quad . \tag{95}$$

An explicit calculation then finds

$$< r|z >= \Big(\frac{2\tau_2}{k}\Big)^{1/4} \ e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2} \, e^{\frac{1}{2}(-iz)^2} \, \Theta \begin{bmatrix} r/k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Big(- ik\sqrt{\frac{\tau_2}{\pi k}}\, z \Big| k\tau \Big) \quad , \tag{96}$$

where the Θ-function with characteristics is defined by[23]

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \Big(z \Big| \tau \Big) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\pi\tau(n+\alpha)^2 + 2i\pi(n+\alpha)(z+\beta)} \quad . \tag{97}$$

With respect to modular transformations, two useful identities for these Θ-functions are,

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} r/k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Big(x \Big| k(\tau+1) \Big) = e^{i\pi r^2/k} \, \Theta \begin{bmatrix} r/k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Big(x \Big| k\tau \Big) \quad , \quad \text{only if } k \text{ is even} \quad , \tag{98}$$

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} r/k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Big(x \Big| -\frac{k}{\tau} \Big) = \frac{1}{k} \, (-ik\tau)^{1/2} \ e^{i\pi\tau r^2/k} \sum_{r'=0}^{k-1} e^{2i\pi r r'/k} \, \Theta \begin{bmatrix} r'/k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Big(- \tau x \Big| k\tau \Big) \quad . \tag{99}$$

References

[1] For a recent discussion, see for example,
J.H. Schwarz, *TASI Lectures on non BPS D-Brane Systems*, preprint `hep-th/9908144` (August 1999).

[2] V.N. Gribov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B139** (1978) 1.

[3] I.M. Singer, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **60** (1978) 7.

[4] For a detailed discussion and references to the original literature, see for example,
J. Govaerts, *Hamiltonian Quantisation and Constrained Dynamics* (Leuven University Press, Leuven, 1991).

[5] E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **117** (1988) 353;
For a review, see,
D. Birmingham, M. Blau, M. Rakowski and G. Thompson, *Physics Reports* **209** (1991) 129.

[6] E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **121** (1988) 351.

[7] J.R. Klauder, *Ann. Phys.* **254** (1997) 419;
J.R. Klauder, *Nucl. Phys.* **B547** (1999) 397.

[8] J. Govaerts, *J. Phys.* **A30** (1997) 603.

[9] J. Govaerts and J.R. Klauder, *Ann. Phys.* **274** (1999) 251.

[10] V.M. Villanueva, J. Govaerts and J.-L. Lucio-Martinez, *Quantisation without Gauge Fixing: Avoiding Gribov Problems through the Physical Projector*, preprint `hep-th/9909033` (September 1999).

[11] M. Bos and V.P. Nair, *Phys. Lett.* **B223** (1989) 61.

[12] M. Bos and V.P. Nair, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A5** (1990) 959.

[13] J.M.F. Labastida and A.V. Ramallo, *Phys. Lett.* **B227** (1989) 92.

[14] G.V. Dunne, R. Jackiw and C.A. Trugenberger, *Ann. Phys.* **194** (1989) 197;
S. Elitzur, G. Moore, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B326** (1989) 108;
H. Murayama, *Z. Phys.* **C48** (1990) 79.

[15] For a recent review, see
G.V. Dunne, *Aspects of Chern-Simons Theory*, preprint `hep-th/9902115` (February 1999).

[16] L. Faddeev and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** (1988) 1692;
J. Govaerts, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A5** (1990) 3625.

[17] I.M. Krichever and S.P. Novikov, in *Physics and Mathematics of Strings*, eds. L. Brink, D. Friedan and A.M. Polyakov (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), pp. 356-388.

[18] C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett.* **B190** (1987) 47.

[19] L. Bonora, A. Lugo, M. Matone and J. Russo, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **123** (1989) 329.

[20] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B153** (1979) 141;
G. 't Hooft, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **81** (1981) 267.

[21] S. Axelrod, S. Della Pietra and E. Witten, *J. Diff. Geom.* **33** (1991) 787.

[22] J.R. Klauder, *Non Canonical Quantization of Gravity. I. Foundations of Affine Quantum Gravity*, preprint `gr-qc/9906013` (June 1999).

[23] L. Alvarez-Gaumé, G. Moore and C. Vafa, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **106** (1986) 40.